

and Nepali *-nt-* becomes *nd* (e.g. Kash. *dand*, Si. *ḡandū*, Lah. *ḡand*, Panj. *dand* from *dantāḥ*). Nevertheless, all these languages in the 3rd plur. have *-n* only: Kash. *-an*, Si. *-antī*, Lah. *-ēn*, Panj. *-an*, Nep. *-an*. That is to say, they show a special treatment of the group *-nt-* in the termination. The Kafir dialect, Ashkun, normally preserves *-nt-* unchanged, but has the 3rd plur. pres. in *-n* (Morgenshtern, op. cit., p. 45).

36. In another dialect area the disintegration was still greater. Already in Apabhraṃśa we have *-ahī*, in which the group *-nt-* is only represented by a nasalization, while the presence of *-h-* is doubtless due to the influence of the 2nd persons. This form accounts for the Central group consisting of Gujarati, Rajasthani, West and East Hindi, and Bhojpuri, all with *-ahī*, *-ai*, or *-ē*.

37. Most languages, like Romani with *-en*, retain the short vowel, even though in the body of the word an original similar short vowel would have been lengthened.

38. We have seen that the consonants, as well as the vowels, of terminations are liable to a development different from that of the same sounds in the body of the word. The special changes in every case, resulting either in the loss of a syllable, the shortening, voicing, assimilation or complete disappearance of a consonant, are those to be expected where the pronunciation is lax and the muscular effort not intense. In other words, the termination behaves as though it were unaccented or not prominent. What was the result of this on the language? Professor Meillet has pointed out how in the special weak pronunciation of absolute finals of Indo-European, demonstrated by Gauthiot, the seeds of the destruction of the inflectional system were already sown. This process was hastened, in Indo-aryan at least, by the phonetic weakness of the whole termination, whether it consisted of one or two or even three syllables. Doubtless the working was from both sides. As other means of expressing grammatical relationship came into being, the terminations would become still more lightly stressed; and it is significant that those languages, such as Hindi, which have preserved least of the old inflectional system, either of noun or verb, have suffered the most violent special phonetic changes in the terminational element.

## 21. Notes on Dardic<sup>1</sup>

### I

#### INTERVOCALIC DENTALS IN SHINA AND KALASHA

1. In drawing attention to some of the archaic features of Khowar (*Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan*, p. 71), Dr. Morgenshtern says: 'The preservation of *t* as *r* . . . is a very archaic feature, with parallels only, to some extent, in Shina, some Kohistani dialects and Romany.'

2. The comparison with Romani is just, particularly if the Syrian dialect is considered, in which also *-t-* appears as *r*, while in the European and Armenian dialects it has become *l*. The comparison with Shina and the Kohistani dialects is very doubtful. This language, like the closely related Kashmiri, presents the usual Indo-aryan treatment of intervocalic *-t-*, namely its disappearance. This is clear from the following examples:<sup>2</sup>

3. Gurezi dialect *alāu* m. bonfire, *lei* f. torchwood (*ālāian*); *koṇṇi* comb (*kāṇkātāḥ*); *gōu* he went (*galāiḥ*); *āi* daughter (*āuḥitā* or *āhiḥā*); *pēi* falls (*pāiati*), *bāus* I was (*bhitāḥ*); *mā* mother (*māiā*); *bēu* willow (*vetasāḥ*); Kohistani dialect *ḡwō* white (*ḡwetāḥ*); *ḡwū*, Koh. *sēu* bridge (*sēuḥ*); *hāt* attack (*hātīḥ*); to then (*tātāḥ*); *ḡā* brother (*bhrātā*); *ḡēi* sheds (*ḡāiāyāt*); *ḡāl* fever (*ḡālāḥ*); *cār* 4 (cf. *cāiṇāḥ*); *condāi* 14 (*cāiṇādaia*); 3rd sing. future in *-ēi* (*-aii*).

4. The case of *-ṛi-* is ambiguous. The consonant of this group in Indo-aryan, has, according to dialect, either the dental or the cerebral development, becoming *a/i* or *aii*. But in Shina *-ṛ-* disappears equally with *-t-* (see p. 246 above); and since the group *ṛi* appears to be cerebralized in Shina (e.g. *kāṛi*, spins, beside Sinh. *kāi*, but generally *kāi*- or *kāi-*), it is possible that *-ṛi-* had a similar development. In this case words like *māu* dead (*mṛiḥ*), *ḡi* ghee (*ḡṛiṇā*) may have had the evolution: *mṛiā* > *mūda*, etc. This would agree with the regular cerebralization of the group *r*+dental in the language of the Shahbazgarhi inscription of Asoka.

5. *-d-*: *pā* foot (*pāḥ*); *pāvōn* foot of bed (*pāḥānāḥ*); *mī* f. fat (*mēdāḥ*); *roḡi* weeps (*rōdāḥ*); but cf. Rom. *rovel* < *rāvati*); *uār* belly (*uāḥānā*); *kāi* cats (*kāḥāḥ*); *ayō* of this kind (cf. *iāḥḥ*); *vāi* water (? *uḥānā*);

<sup>1</sup> *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, iv, 3, 1927, pp. 533-41.

<sup>2</sup> The Shina words quoted are taken from Dr. Grahame Bailey's *Shina Grammar* and Lt.-Col. Lorimer's articles in *JRAS* and *BSOS*.

*ūyānū* hungry (*udanyūlī*); *cōi* (*iriyodasia*, cf. Shahbazgarhi *todasia*: the origin of *-r-* in Pali *terasa*, etc., is doubtful).

With possible Middle Indian *-ḍ-*: *hiṣ* heart (*hiḍayam*); *bāi* (*devāḍāsa*; but cf. Shahbazgarhi *badaya* with a dental opposed to Kalsi *devāḍāsa* with a cerebral).

6. The fate of the aspirates is the same: *-th-*: *gāē* song (*gāihā*); *mail* buttermilk (*mathiām*); *pumiḥ* first (*praihamāh*); *śāgū* dung (*-gūihā-?*).

With possible M.I. *-th-*: *kāyēi* boils, tr. (*kvathate*; cf. Pali *kaphiṇo*).

*-dh-*: *gum* wheat (*godhīmah*); *mōru* sweet (*madhural*); Koh. *mo* wine (*mādhū*).

7. The only one of these intervocalic dentals which presents certain apparent exceptions is *-t-*.

The past participle is formed in various ways. Of these forms like *gōu* (*gatiḥ*), *mūu* (*mytiḥ*), *būu* (*bhūtiḥ*), show the regular development of *-t-*. Others ending in *-lu*, *-tu*, *-du*, *-ku* go back to Middle Indian consonant groups derived from *ṣi*, *hi*, *ti*, *pi*, *gḍhi*, *dh*, *bdhi*; *kn*, *kv*, *śh* (either directly or by analogical extension), and are paralleled in the north-western languages of India proper—Sindhi, Lahnda, and Panjabi.

8. A third important class, however, ends in *-lu* or *-tlu*. These sometimes exist side by side with other forms: e.g. *būlus* and *būus*. There can be little doubt that they are extensions of the past participle in *-ta-* with the Middle Indian suffix *-illa-*, and are strictly comparable with similar past participle forms in Marathi, Gujarati, Bihari, Oriya, and Bengali, in which there is no doubt as to the fate of *-t-* (cf. Bloch, *La langue marathe*, p. 256). There is therefore no question of the survival of *-t-* as *-l-* in these forms.

9. There is, however, one word in which *l* certainly, and a few others in which it possibly, corresponds to Sanskrit *-t-*: *śal* 100 = Skt. *śatām*; *gal* f. wound, appears to belong to Skt. *ghāṭih*; *jil* m. life, *lel* m. blood, and *lel* visible, may be participial forms from *jivitā*, *lohitā*, and *lokhitā* respectively of the type of *mail* (*mathiām*) already discussed with M.I. suffix *-illa-*. *galō* m., lighted torch, is < \**praloka-*, not Skt. *kṣāṭih*; *unil* (in *unil* *mā* wet-nurse), which it is at first tempting to derive directly from Skt. *unnēṭ-*, appears to be an adjective (used also in the masculine: *unilū mālu* foster-father), and therefore is suspect of containing the adjectival suffix *-illa-*, and to be a derivative of the verb *unilē* rears (*unmayai*; cf. *Kharoshthi Inscriptions*, ed. Rapson, Senart and Boyer, *passim*, where *kudaga unidaḡa* seems to be used in the sense of 'adopted son').

10. It is impossible to see any difference of condition which in these  
, Suggested to me by Mr. F. S. Noble of St. John's College, Cambridge.

words might lead to a different development of *-t-*: cf. e.g. *gōu* = *gatiḥ* beside *śal* = *śatām*. If, therefore, in any of these words *-l-* is descended from *-t-*, the word in which it occurs must have been borrowed from another dialect, in which that change was regular. The word in which *-l-* most certainly represents *-t-*, *śal*, is one particularly susceptible of borrowing (cf., e.g., the remark of Leitner in his *Languages and Races of Dardistan*, vol. i, p. 8: 'It is difficult for these races to realize anything above a hundred and sometimes above twenty.' Further, a number of West Pahari dialects, which normally retain initial *ś-*, have a word for '100' beginning with the dental *s-*, evidently borrowed from the Plains).

11. But from what language are the Shina words with *l* < *-t-* borrowed? One would be tempted to see in *śal* the effect of Pashto on Shina on a native \**śau*, were it not that the influence of Pashto on Shina is otherwise negligible.

12. May we suppose that in the neighbouring Khovar (which, we see, now has *r* for *-t-*) the evolution was from *-t-* through *-ḍ-* to *-l-*, and then to *-r-*? Against that we find original *-l-* still preserved unchanged (e.g. *kaphāl* head, cf. *kaphālam*, and *pašāl* shepherd < *paṣpālāh*).

13. We have seen above that of the Romani dialects one represents *-t-* by *r* as in Khovar, the others by *l*. Is there a Hindu Kush dialect which also keeps *-t-* as *l*? I think it is to be found in Kalasha, the south-west neighbour of Khovar. Unfortunately our knowledge of the language is very small, being confined to the words and specimens given in the *Linguistic Survey of India*, viii, 2, and in the monographs of Leitner, on which they are based. Nevertheless, there seem to be a number of words in which *l* or *u* corresponds to Skt. *-t-*. I suggest that either the *l* was in process of becoming *u* and had perhaps so become in certain conditions, or was a velar *l*, which the observer heard as *u*. The most cogent proof of this is that in at least three words original *-l-* is represented by *u* or *o*. There can be no doubt as to the identity of *kao* year, with Garvi *kālā* years, Maiba *kāla*, Shina *kai*: Skt. *kālāh*. Similarly *ango* finger (*angulih*), *leue* oil (*lailām*).

14. For *-t-*, we have the 3rd sing. present or future (Skt. *-ati*): *dali* gives (cf. Pali *dehi*), *jugal* sees, *tiel* beats, *sapral* finds (\**sampatati*? cf. Skt. *sānpatati*). Only *dali* ends in *-i*, which can scarcely be derived from Skt. *-i* of *-ati*; a similar sporadic *-i* appears in the 3rd plural, and, as we shall see, regularly in the 2nd plural of the past tense (with this, perhaps, may be compared the *-i* endings of Syrian and Asiatic Romani, and of the 3rd plural of the Sindhi present). The majority of the forms end in *-u*: *šiu* there is (*šete*), *oneu* brings (*ānyati*), *iu* comes (*ēti*), *pareu* goes (*pāraiti*),

*piu* drinks (*pihati*), *kāreu* does (*kārayati*), *ciṣeu* stands (*iṣṣhati*), *niseu* sits (*niṣṣḍai*?); cf. also *ṣū* eats, *sangāu* hears (cf. Armenian Romani *sanh-id*?), *āḍō* is (*āṣate*?).

15. There is some reason (notably the preservation of the augment, which is discussed below) for supposing that the past tense of Kalasha rests not upon the past participle, but on the old imperfect or aorist. If that is so, the 3rd singular which is given in every case except one—*sangyet* he heard—as ending in -o or -u, must rest either upon the middle endings of Sanskrit -*aia*, which is not likely, or have acquired its ending from the present. This last is not improbable, for the complete disappearance of the final -*i* would leave the 3rd person undifferentiated from the 1st and 2nd persons. On the other hand, the 2nd plural, which in every case is given as ending in -*hi*, seems to represent Skt. -*īa* (with an additional vowel element), and thus provides a contrast to the treatment of -*th*, which in the 2nd plur. present disappears. Thus:

Present	Past
<i>ona</i> < <i>ānaya</i> <i>tha</i>	<i>oni</i> < <i>ānaya</i> <i>ta</i>
<i>para</i> < <i>pārē</i> <i>tha</i>	<i>parā</i> < * <i>parāyā</i> <i>ta</i> , cf. <i>parāia</i>
<i>piā</i> < <i>pihā</i> <i>tha</i>	<i>awī</i> < <i>īpihā</i> <i>ta</i>
<i>kāra</i> < <i>kārayā</i> <i>tha</i>	<i>ārī</i> < <i>ākārayā</i> <i>ta</i>
<i>ciṣa</i> < <i>iṣṣhā</i> <i>tha</i>	<i>aciṣī</i> < <i>āiṣṣhā</i> <i>ta</i>
<i>ṣūa</i>	<i>āṣī</i> < * <i>āṣā</i> <i>ta</i>
<i>evō</i> , cf. <i>iṭhā</i>	<i>ā</i> < * <i>āyā</i> <i>ta</i> , cf. <i>āia</i>
<i>niseō</i> , cf. <i>niṣṣḍai</i> <i>tha</i>	<i>niṣā</i> < <i>nyāṣā</i> <i>ta</i>

In this case the -*i* preceding the palatal vowel -*i* (whatever its origin) is preserved unchanged as in the case of *dai*, and two other words (of unknown etymology) *kāi* cheeks, *prāi* light.

16. The past participles quoted in *L.S.I.* (ib., p. 73) are from forms with M.L. -*ti* (*kerṭita*: cf. Panj. *ditṭā*) or -*mi* (*kuina*, *awōiena*?). *Saprek* is difficult; is it an infinitive? But *iṭhālo* (if we allow a different development of initial *sth*- from medial -*sth*-—cf. *kāt* hand < *hastā*, *broṣṣona* from the top < *bariṣṣha*-—as in European Romani in which -*sth*- remains, but *sth*- becomes *th*-) would represent *iṭhāpiṭ*. In the Vocabulary (*L.S.I.*, viii, 2, p. 128) appears *gālah*, gone, which may be Skt. *gatā*.

17. Even more striking is the declension of *chā* daughter although, if correctly observed by Leitner, the relation of its initial with that of Khowar *ṣūr* < Skt. *duhitā* (cf. Morgenshterne, op. cit., p. 71) is not clear. The singular is *chū* (< \**chua*, \**chul*-?); the plural *chilāi*. Finally, we have *harīlā* green, and perhaps *harīla* brass: Skt. *haritā*.

18. The fate of -*d* is less clear. Perhaps it was lost.<sup>1</sup> There are several forms quoted of the verb *niṣk*, to sit (if this despite its dental *s* is to be referred to *niṣṣḍai* or *niṣḍai*: see below), without any trace of *l* or *n*. Similarly, *prah* I gave (see § 28) may be Skt. *prādāṁ* or *prādām*. In *hēra* heart (*hydayam*) *r* represents *d*, cerebralized from *d*. This seems to be the regular development of M.L. -*d*: e.g. *mrakro* monkey (*mrakarakāh*), *saprel* (cf. Pkt. *sampṛadai*). Cf. also what was said above of the cerebralization of the group *r*+dental in Shina.

19. The only example of -*th* is the termination -*aitha* of the 2nd plural where, as shown above, it disappears. But -*th*, especially in a termination (see above, p. 299), may have a different fate from -*f*. Such an assumption would explain the ending of the 2nd plural in -*a*, which is given in all the forms except *evō* and *niseō*. Perhaps this is the development of Armenian Romani in *miñil* buttermilk (*matihām*: though this may be a case of dissimilation), and of European Romani in the termination of the 2nd plural -*en* < -*aithana*.

20. The only instance of -*dh*- is *maḥora* sweet (*maḥurāh*). The balance of evidence is in favour of a similar loss in Romani<sup>1</sup>, and we know that this sound was one of the first to lose its occlusion, appearing even in the Rīgveda in certain words and terminations as -*h*-.

21. This explanation leaves on one side the two exceptional forms of the 2nd plural: *evō* you go, *niseō* you sit.

22. The hardest word to explain is *biṣi* 20. Khowar *biṣi* obviously goes back to a form \**viṣaiti* (cf. Skt. *vināśith*), but Shina *bṣ*, and the majority of the other Indo-aryan forms go back to an earlier \**viṣat*; cf. Pali *viṣam* formed after *tiṣam*. In that case -*i* would not belong to the original word.

23. The evidence that -*f* became -*h* in Kalasha is thus seen to be fairly strong; and we may imagine that Kalasha, now restricted to a very small area and separated from the Shins by Khowar, may at one time have had a wider extension.

24. There can be little doubt that the Gypsies, although the oldest sound-changes of their language show that originally it belonged to the same group as the modern Central languages (see above, pp. 251 ff.) were associated at an early period with the ancestors of the North-west languages. Is it, then, mere coincidence that we find two groups, both in Dardic and in Romani, one characterized by the change of -*f*- to *l*, the other by its change to *r*?

<sup>1</sup> As also in Khowar, according to a communication from Dr. Morgenshterne.

## II

## SURVIVAL OF THE SANSKRIT AUGMENT

25. On p. 71 of his *Report* Dr. Morgenshterne draws attention to the very interesting fact that in Khowar 'possibly traces of the augment are preserved in some irregular verbs; e.g. *bām* I can: *abēlam* I could; *brūm* I die: *obritai* he died; *nēm* I take out: *onēlam* I took out; *śer* it is (< *śete*): *ośoi* it was (< *aśayat*); *šibom* I eat: *oyotam* I ate'.

26. In India proper and in Ceylon the augmented tenses soon disappeared. Pali has the aorist and Prakrit traces of the imperfect; but both quickly gave way to the nominal construction, and their place was taken by the past participle (see J. Bloch, *La Phrase nominale en sanskrit*). If the augment was to survive, it could only be in a language which preserved one of the augmented tenses, aorist or imperfect. The imperfect (of *bhū-*) and the aorist both occur in the Inscriptions of Aśoka; but it is noteworthy that except for the otherwise monosyllabic *aho* (cf. the preservation of dissyllabic augmented forms in Armenian, and the absence in Homeric Greek of augmented forms of otherwise monosyllabic past tenses such as *έγορον*) the only augmented forms occur in the Gīṃar and Shāhbazgarī recensions. In the Khowar examples quoted above the only one which directly represents one of these tenses is *ośoi* < *aśayat*. In the others some element, perhaps an auxiliary verb, has been added to the form of the verb. This form cannot be the past participle in *-ta-* (as in the majority of Indo-aryan languages) which ends in *-iru* and is found in the compound tense, e.g. *ganirū ośoi* he had taken. We may reasonably suppose that it was added to the old imperfect (or aorist); just as, e.g., in Gujarati the present auxiliary *chū*, etc., has been added to the old present to form the new present tense. This process was doubtless encouraged by the fact that the endings of the imperfect did not remain easily distinguishable owing to the loss of final consonants (in distinction to the present in which the consonants protected by following vowels partially survived).

27. Even in the case of *ośoi* the element *-ta-* has been added in the 1st singular and the 1st and 2nd plural:

<i>ośiam</i>	<i>ośiam</i>
<i>ośō</i>	<i>ośiamī</i>
<i>ośoi</i>	<i>ośomi</i>

Of the forms without *-ta-*, *ośō* may be derived from *aśiyah*. In *ośoi* from *aśayat* the final *-i* is probably a later addition, and is perhaps parallel with the *-i* found in Kalasha 3rd singular and plural of the present, and

again in the 3rd plural present and past of Khowar (e.g. *ganini* they take). The 3rd plural *ośomi* cannot represent *aśayan*, but presumably owes its ending to the present.

28. This survival of the augment has a striking parallel in the neighbouring Kalasha. The *LSI* contains the following forms:

*śiu* there is (*śete*)  
*pim* I drink (*pibāmi*)

*aśis* there was (*aśayat*)  
*axis* (Leiner) *apis* (*LSI*) I drank  
(*āpibam*)

*kārem* I do (*kārdyāmi* or *karōmi*)  
*āris* I did (*dhārayam* or *dhakaravam*  
or *dhakarāmi*)

*bām* I shall be (*bhācāmi*)  
*cišim* I stand (*tīṣhāmi*)  
*hāwis* I became (*abhaavam*)  
*acišis* I stood (*ātiṣṭham*)

*im* I come (*ēmi*)  
*apbūco* he asked (*āpucchāt*)  
*ah* I came (*dyam*)  
*apbūco* he asked (*āpucchāt*)  
*ah* I came (*dyam*)

*parah* I went (*parāyam*)

Some presents have pasts from different roots or compounded roots:  
*iagem* I see  
*āwasu* he saw (*āpaśyat*)  
*āsis* I ate (*\*āśam*, cf. aor. subj.  
*āsit*)

*dem* I give (cf. Pali *dehi*)  
*prah* I gave (*prādādam* or *prādāmi*)

Some of the past tenses of uncertain etymology also show initial *a-*:  
*aśō* he entreated, *ayisto* it left, *awōjo* he said (but cf. *awōjena* having said?).

29. In the verb *nimim*, I sit, dental *s* is unexpected (instead of *ṣ*) if it is derived from *niśidati* or *niśadati* (cf. Khowar *niṣik*). It is due to the influence of the past *niśā* I sat < *niśādam* (i.e. *niśādam*).

30. In a compound verb beginning with *ā* the augment is concealed as in Sanskrit: *ōrim* I bring (*ānyāmi*); *ōris* I brought (*ānyam*). Forms like this may have encouraged the loss of the augment evidenced by some pasts: *jagis* I saw, *tripau* it burnt, *bandau* he ordered, *kurau* he collected (? < *\*krynā* beside Skt. *kivāti*, cf. Gk. *κεράννυμι*, *κίρηντι*), *śurūis* it fell (? *\*śaḍ-*: Hindi *śarṇā*: cf. Skt. *śāḍat*), *sangādes* he heard, *sawōjan* he kissed, *unbulau* he prophesied.

31. In the majority of cases cited above, the consonant after the augment has its phonetic development: e.g. *āris* < *ākaravam*, *axis* < *āpibam*, *āwasu* < *āpaśyat*, *hāwis* < *\*ahaw-* < *abhaavam*, *apbūco* < *\*apucch-* (cf. Kharoṣṭhi Inscriptions *pichat*) < *āpucchāt*. In some cases the influence of the present has re-established the consonant: e.g. *acišis* after the present *cīšim*. This may be the explanation of the form *apis* (past to *pim* I drink)

given in *LSI* instead of Leitner's phonetically correct *awis*; and for the past of *bām* in the new sense, *abayeni* they could, beside the form of the past in the older sense, *hāwis* I became.

32. The derivation of the past tense in Kalasha from the Sanskrit imperfect or aorist is strengthened by a further consideration. It has been pointed out that the majority of modern Indo-aryan languages form their past tense and their past participle from the same stem, namely that of the past participle of Sanskrit. All the more striking, therefore, is the opposition offered by Kalasha between the past tense and the past participle of the verb 'to go': the former is, as we have seen, *parah* I went (*parāyam*), the latter *gālah* gone (*gatain*). A similar opposition is seen in the verb 'to give': *prau* he gave (*prādat*) but *dīa* given (if in *keṛ(e)* *dīa*, cut, this represents *\*dīta-*, cf. Panj. *dīta*).

33. The conjugation of the present in Kalasha (with the exception of the 1st plural, which has been altered by the addition of a suffix *-k*, perhaps to avoid confusion with the 1st singular) is derivable directly from the Sanskrit:

Skt.	Kal.
<i>piāmī</i>	<i>pim</i>
<i>piāsī</i>	<i>pis</i>
<i>piāti</i>	<i>piu</i>
<i>piāmāḥ</i>	[ <i>pik</i> ]
<i>piātha</i>	<i>pia</i>
<i>piānti</i>	<i>pin</i>

34. The imperfect, as has been suggested for Khowar, is more liable to alteration and reformation owing to the loss of its final consonants. Where the consonants were protected, namely in the 1st and 2nd plural, the old forms are kept (with the addition of *-i*):

Phonetic	Skt.	development	Kal.
	<i>dībām</i>	<i>*awī</i>	<i>awis</i>
	<i>dībāḥ</i>	<i>awī</i>	<i>awī</i>
	<i>dībat</i>	<i>*awī</i>	<i>awis</i> (Leitner) <i>apiaw</i> ( <i>LSI</i> )
	<i>dībāma</i>	<i>*awim</i>	<i>awima</i>
	<i>dībāla</i>	<i>*awil</i>	<i>awi</i> (Leitner) <i>apili</i> ( <i>LSI</i> )
	<i>dīban</i>	<i>*awā</i>	<i>am</i> " <i>apian</i> "

The 1st singular is distinguished from the 2nd and 3rd singular by the addition of *-s* (of unknown origin: perhaps an auxiliary; cf. Khowar 1st

singular *oīam* beside 3rd singular *oōr*). Some 1st persons singular are given without *-s*: *ah* I came, *parah* I went, *prah* I gave, *mid* I sat.

The 2nd singular phonetically represents the Sanskrit.

In the 3rd singular the form given by Leitner agrees with one form only given in the *LSI*, namely *sangāyes* he heard: all the other past tenses in the 3rd singular both in Leitner and in the *LSI* end either in *-u* or *-o*. I have suggested above that this is the ending of the present imported into the past to distinguish the 3rd singular from the 2nd singular.

The 1st and 2nd plural phonetically represent the Sanskrit, with the addition of *-i*.

The 3rd plural also appears to have the ending of the present, to distinguish it from the original 1st, 2nd, and 3rd singular.